

FACT SHEET

ORDER NO. R5-2005-XXX
NPDES NO. CA0085154
VISALIA MEDICAL CLINIC, INC.
TULARE COUNTY

I. INTRODUCTION

Visalia Medical Clinic, Inc., a California corporation, owns and operates an outpatient medical clinic approximately 2 ½ miles west of Visalia. Visalia Medical Clinic, Inc., is hereafter referred to as Discharger. Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 97-119 regulated the discharge; however, the Order expired before the Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) as required by federal regulations. The Discharger submitted a RWD, dated 21 April 2003, and applied for a permit to discharge waste under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

II. BENEFICIAL USES OF THE RECEIVING WATER

The facility discharges to Mill Creek. Mill Creek is an ephemeral stream tributary to Cross Creek approximately 10 miles downstream of the discharge. During wet years, Cross Creek discharges to the Tule River, approximately 15 miles downstream of the confluence of Mill Creek with Cross Creek. The *Water Quality Control Plan for the Tulare Lake Basin, Second Edition* (hereafter Basin Plan) specifies beneficial uses of Valley Floor Waters and, therefore, Mill Creek as:

- agricultural supply (AGR);
- industrial service supply (IND);
- industrial process supply (PRO);
- water contact recreation (REC-1);
- non-contact water recreation (REC-2);
- warm freshwater habitat (including spawning) (WARM);
- wildlife habitat (WILD);
- support of rare, threatened, or endangered species (RARE); and
- groundwater recharge (GWR).

Based on information from the “Lines of Equal Elevation of Water Wells in Unconfined Aquifer,” published by the Department of Water Resources in Spring 1995, the depth of groundwater in the region is about 95 feet below ground surface. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, IND, PRO, AGR, REC-1, and REC-2.

Mill Creek is an intermittent stream. The intermittent nature of Mill Creek means that the designated beneficial uses must be protected, but that no credit for receiving water dilution is available. Dry conditions occur primarily in the summer months, but may also occur throughout the year, particularly in low rainfall years. The lack of dilution results in more stringent effluent limitations for attainment of agricultural water quality goals and aquatic life protection.

III. DESCRIPTION OF EFFLUENT

The Discharger's effluent consists of non-contact cooling water from the Visalia Medical Clinic's 150-ton air conditioning unit. Residual chlorine is present in the discharge, though the Discharger does not add chemicals to its cooling water. Thus, the residual chlorine in the discharge is likely from the supply water. The discharge is not treated and flow is intermittent over a 24-hour period because the air-conditioning unit is turned off nightly.

The Discharger's Report of Waste Discharge describes the discharge as follows:

Average Daily Flow Rate:	207,427 gallons per day
Maximum Daily Flow Rate:	235,000 gallons per day
Average Daily Temperature:	91 ° F Summer; 84° F Winter
Average Daily pH:	7.2 standard units

Source water for the facility is provided by California Water Service Company. Supply water was monitored on 3 April 2003. Based on this sample, characteristics of the supply water include the following:

Constituent

Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	200 mg/L
Conductivity @ 25 ° C	266 µmhos/cm
pH	6.9 standard units

The facility submitted data taken March through October 2003. Based on these data, the characteristics of the discharge are as follows:

Constituent

Average of All Samples (March – October 2003)

Temperature	80.5 °F
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	205 mg/L (2 samples)
Conductivity @ 25 ° C	261 µmhos/cm
pH	6.9 – 8.1 standard units (range)
Chlorine (Total)	0.44 mg/L (2 samples)

IV. SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE CURRENT ORDER

This Order includes changes from the previous Order. A summary of the key changes is as follows:

A. Final Effluent Limitations

- Revision of maximum the flow limitation from 0.26 mgd to 0.24 mgd to reflect the rounded maximum daily flow in the report of waste discharge.
- Revision of the pH limit to reflect the range required by the water quality objective (WQO) for pH in the Basin Plan.
- Addition of total residual chlorine limit to comply with the narrative WQO for toxic substances from the Basin Plan interpreted using USEPA's recommended acute and chronic aquatic life criteria for chlorine.
- The Basin Plan states that "[a]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. This objective applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the interactive effect of multiple substances." The Basin Plan requires that "[a]s a minimum, compliance with this objective...shall be evaluated with a 96-hour bioassay." Order No. R5-2005-XXX requires both acute and chronic toxicity monitoring to evaluate compliance with this WQO.

The Basin Plan further states that "...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed..." Effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in the Order.

B. Receiving Water Limitations

- Addition of receiving water limitations for ammonia, fecal coliform, floating material, pesticides, radionuclides, temperature, and taste and odor based on the water quality objectives from the Basin Plan.

C. Groundwater Limitations

- Addition of a groundwater limitation proscribing the discharge from causing underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents in concentrations greater than natural background quality.

D. Provisions

- A requirement to conduct priority pollutant (CTR constituents) and 2,3,7,8-TetraCDD congener (SIP, Section 3) monitoring of the effluent and receiving water to address deficiencies in monitoring required by the letter from the Regional Board dated

27 February 2001 to implement the requirements of the SIP. Monitoring for all priority pollutants/congeners is required for the receiving water; and monitoring for 35 priority pollutant/congener parameters is required for the effluent.

E. Monitoring and Reporting Program

- Addition of effluent, water supply, and receiving water monitoring requirements for total residual chlorine to determine whether the discharge complies with total residual chlorine effluent limitations and to determine whether the supply water is the source of total residual chlorine.
- Revision of the receiving water monitoring requirements to include receiving water monitoring downstream of the discharge even when effluent is the only flow in Mill Creek. Addition of this requirement allows the Regional Board to assess the potential effects of the effluent once it reaches a point downstream of the point of discharge.
- A requirement to conduct effluent and receiving water monitoring for priority pollutants two times at the end of the term of this Order to provide data for a reasonable potential analysis for the next Order and to comply with the requirements of the SIP.
- A requirement to conduct whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing. WET testing indicates the toxicity level of a single pollutant or a mixture of pollutants in the effluent by measuring the degree of response of exposed aquatic test organisms. The WET approach allows for protection of the narrative “no toxics in toxic amounts” criterion while implementing numeric criteria for toxicity. There are two types of WET tests: acute and chronic. An acute toxicity test is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality. A chronic toxicity test is conducted over a longer period of time and may measure mortality, reproduction, and growth.

The Basin Plan specifies a narrative objective for toxicity, requiring that all waters be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or produce other detrimental response on aquatic organisms. This Order implements acute toxicity limits and monitoring to address Basin Plan requirements.

In addition to the Basin Plan requirements, Section 4 of the SIP states that a chronic toxicity effluent limitation is required in permits for all discharges that will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to chronic toxicity in receiving waters. This Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic toxicity testing.

V. REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS AND EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that “are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any

state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality.” Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that “[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits.”

The Discharger was issued an order on 27 February 2001 pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) Section 13267, requiring effluent and receiving water monitoring meeting the requirements of the SIP to assist the Regional Board in conducting reasonable potential analyses (RPAs).

On 15 January 2002, the Discharger submitted effluent data for priority pollutants for a sample taken on 21 May 2001. The Discharger submitted additional effluent data for priority pollutants and other constituents for a sample taken on 24 April 2003. For 35 constituents, there were no effluent data provided. The Discharger did not submit receiving water data for any constituents beyond those included in monthly receiving water monitoring requirements in Order No. 97-119 (i.e., dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, temperature, and conductivity).

Section 1.3 of the SIP requires that the Regional Board impose water quality-based effluent limitations for a priority pollutant if (1) the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the most stringent CTR or NTR criterion or applicable site-specific Basin Plan objective, or (2) the ambient background concentration is greater than the CTR or NTR criterion or applicable site-specific Basin Plan objective and the pollutant is detected in the effluent, or (3) other information is available to determine that a water quality-based effluent limitation is necessary to protect beneficial uses.

The RPA for CTR constituents was based on effluent monitoring data from the samples collected on 21 May 2001 and 24 April 2003. Based on the RPA methodology in the SIP, no constituents have been found to have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above water quality objectives or water quality criteria in the receiving water. Many of the constituents were not detected in the effluent and many do not have applicable numeric water quality criteria or objectives to be compared against the MEC. Based on the RPA, no effluent limits currently are required for priority pollutants.

The results of the RPA are summarized in the table below.

1. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis Results – CTR Constituents

<u>CTR #</u>	<u>PRIORITY POLLUTANTS</u>	<u>Maximum Effluent Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Maximum Background Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Governing WQO/WQC (µg/l)</u>	<u>RPA Result²</u>
1	Antimony	0.1	No data	4300	No
2	Arsenic	0.2	No data	150	No

NPDES NO. CA0085154

VISALIA MEDICAL CLINIC, INC.

TULARE COUNTY

<u>CTR #</u>	<u>PRIORITY POLLUTANTS</u>	<u>Maximum Effluent Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Maximum Background Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Governing WQO/WQC (µg/l)</u>	<u>RPA Result²</u>
3	Beryllium	0.02	No data	No Criteria	Uo
4	Cadmium	0.02	No data	0.26	No
5a	Chromium (III)	3	No data	201	No
5b	Chromium (VI)	1.2	No data	11.4	No
6	Copper	2.0	No data	9.03	No
7	Lead	0.4	No data	3.03	No
8	Mercury	0.02	No data	0.051	No
9	Nickel	0.1	No data	50.5	No
10	Selenium	0.2	No data	5.0	No
11	Silver	0.1	No data	3.80	No
12	Thallium	0.02	No data	6.30	No
13	Zinc	39	No data	116	No
14	Cyanide	1	No data	5.2	No
15	Asbestos (millions / liter)	0.2	No data	No criteria	Uo
16	2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	No data	No data	1.4×10^{-8}	Ud
17	Acrolein	52	No data	780	No
18	Acrylonitrile	25	No data	0.66	No
19	Benzene	0.26	No data	71	No
20	Bromoform	0.4	No data	360	No
21	Carbon Tetrachloride	0.38	No data	4.4	No
22	Chlorobenzene	0.23	No data	21000	No
23	Chlordibromomethane	0.5	No data	34	No
24	Chloroethane	0.5	No data	No Criteria	Uo
25	2-Chloroethylvinyl Ether	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
26	Chloroform	0.21	No data	No Criteria	Uo
27	Dichlorobromomethane	0.21	No data	46	No
28	1,1-Dichloroethane	0.22	No data	No Criteria	Uo
29	1,2-Dichloroethane	0.22	No data	99	No
30	1,1-Dichloroethylene	0.19	No data	3.2	No
31	1,2-Dichloropropane	0.17	No data	39	No
32	1,3-Dichloropropylene	0.39	No data	1700	No
33	Ethylbenzene	0.2	No data	29000	No
34	Methyl Bromide	57	No data	4000	No
35	Methyl Chloride	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
36	Methylene Chloride	0.82	No data	1600	No
37	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.21	No data	11	No
38	Tetrachloroethylene	0.5	No data	8.85	No
39	Toluene	0.15	No data	200000	No
40	1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene	No data	No data	140000	Ud
41	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.23	No data	No Criteria	Uo
42	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.28	No data	42	No
43	Trichloroethylene	0.23	No data	81	No
44	Vinyl Chloride	0.25	No data	525	No
45	Chlorophenol	No data	No data	400	Ud

NPDES NO. CA0085154

VISALIA MEDICAL CLINIC, INC.

TULARE COUNTY

<u>CTR #</u>	<u>PRIORITY POLLUTANTS</u>	<u>Maximum Effluent Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Maximum Background Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Governing WQO/WQC (µg/l)</u>	<u>RPA Result²</u>
46	2,4-Dichlorophenol	No data	No data	790	Ud
47	2,4-Dimethylphenol	No data	No data	2300	Ud
48	2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol	No data	No data	765	Ud
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	No data	No data	14000	Ud
50	2-Nitrophenol	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
51	4-Nitrophenol	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
52	3-Methyl-4-Chlorophenol	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
53	Pentachlorophenol	No data	No data	6.7	Ud
54	Phenol	No data	No data	4600000	Ud
55	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	No data	No data	6.5	Ud
56	Acenaphthene	1.5	No data	2700	No
57	Acenaphthylene	1.1	No data	No Criteria	Uo
58	Anthracene	1.6	No data	110000	No
59	Benzidine	24	No data	0.0005	No
60	Benzo(a)Anthracene	1.3	No data	0.049	No
61	Benzo(a)Pyrene	0.1	No data	0.049	No
62	Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	1.3	No data	0.049	No
63	Benzo(ghi)Perylene	1.5	No data	No Criteria	Uo
64	Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	1.6	No data	0.049	No
65	Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	1.2	No data	No Criteria	Uo
66	Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	2.8	No data	1.4	No
67	Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	1.3	No data	170000	No
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	1.6	No data	5.9	No
69	4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	No data	No data	No Criteria	Uo
70	Butylbenzyl Phthalate	No data	No data	5200	Ud
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	1.1	No data	4300	No
72	4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	1.5	No data	No Criteria	Uo
73	Chrysene	1.7	No data	0.049	No
74	Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene	1.4	No data	0.049	No
75	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	No data	17000	No
76	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	No data	2600	No
77	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	No data	2600	No
78	3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	9.1	No data	0.077	No
79	Diethyl Phthalate	1.7	No data	120000	No
80	Dimethyl Phthalate	1.6	No data	2900000	No
81	Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	No data	No data	12000	Ud
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	1.6	No data	9.1	No
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	1.4	No data	No Criteria	Uo
84	Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	1.2	No data	No Criteria	Uo
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	No data	No data	0.54	Ud
86	Fluoranthene	1.8	No data	370	No
87	Fluorene	1.3	No data	14000	No
88	Hexachlorobenzene	1.5	No data	0.00077	No
89	Hexachlorobutadiene	0.5	No data	50	No

<u>CTR #</u>	<u>PRIORITY POLLUTANTS</u>	<u>Maximum Effluent Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Maximum Background Concentration or Minimum Method Detection Limit¹ (µg/l)</u>	<u>Governing WQO/WQC (µg/l)</u>	<u>RPA Result²</u>
90	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	0.59	No data	17000	No
91	Hexachloroethane	1.1	No data	8.9	No
92	Indeno(1,2,3-cd) Pyrene	1.4	No data	0.049	No
93	Isophorone	1.1	No data	600	No
94	naphthalene	0.5	No data	No Criteria	Uo
95	Nitrobenzene	1.6	No data	1900	No
96	N-Nitrosodimethylamine	1.8	No data	8.1	No
97	N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	1.7	No data	1.4	No
98	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	3.6	No data	16	No
99	Phenanthrene	1.7	No data	No Criteria	Uo
100	Pyrene	1.3	No data	11000	No
101	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0.5	No data	No Criteria	Uo
102	Aldrin	0.0038	No data	0.0001	No
103	alpha-BHC	0.0042	No data	0.013	No
104	beta-BHC	0.0043	No data	0.046	No
105	gamma-BHC	0.0042	No data	0.063	No
106	delta-BHC	0.0034	No data	No Criteria	Uo
107	Chlordane	0.005	No data	0.00059	No
108	4,4-DDT	0.012	No data	0.00059	No
109	4,4-DDE	0.0039	No data	0.00059	No
110	4,4-DDD	0.0045	No data	0.00084	No
111	Dieldrin	0.005	No data	0.00014	No
112	alpha-Endosulfan	0.0038	No data	0.056	No
113	beta-Endosulfan	0.0098	No data	0.056	No
114	Endosulfan Sulfate	0.012	No data	240	No
115	Endrin	0.0044	No data	0.036	No
116	Endrin Aldehyde	0.013	No data	0.81	No
117	Heptachlor	0.0038	No data	0.00021	No
118	Heptachlor Epoxide	0.0039	No data	0.00011	No
119-125	PCBs sum ³	0.52	No data	0.00017	No
126	Toxaphene	0.2	No data	0.0002	No

¹ Concentration in **bold** is the actual detected MEC or Background concentration; otherwise the concentration shown is the minimum method detection limit (MDL).

² RP = Yes, if either MEC > WQO/WQC or background > WQO/WQC and the pollutant is detected in the effluent.

RP = No, if (1) both MEC and background < WQO/WQC or (2) no background and all effluent data non-detect, or no background and MEC < WQO/WQC.

RP = Ud (undetermined due to lack of effluent monitoring data).

RP = Uo (undetermined if no objective or criterion promulgated).

³ PCBs sum refers to the sum of PCB-1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, 1260.

2. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis – Non-CTR Constituents

Flow

Flow is limited to a maximum daily flow of 0.24 mgd based on the facility's Report of Waste Discharge.

pH

The Basin Plan requires that the pH of receiving waters not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.3 standard units. The effluent limitation for pH implements this WQO from the Basin Plan.

Total Residual Chlorine

The Basin Plan states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." Effluent samples taken by the Discharger on 21 May 2001 and 24 April 2003 had chlorine concentrations (based on field tests) of 0.28 mg/l or 280 µg/l and 0.60 mg/l or 600 µg/l, respectively. The USEPA has established a National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection for chlorine of 19 µg/l as a 1-hour average (acute) concentration, and 11 µg/l as a 4-day average (chronic) concentration. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that the discharge of chlorine in the facility's effluent has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of the narrative toxicity objective from the Basin Plan.

This Order includes effluent limitations for total residual chlorine calculated as 0.01 mg/L as a monthly average (AMEL) and 0.02 mg/L as a daily maximum (MDEL) using procedures in USEPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*. The following equations are taken from the TSD:

$$\begin{aligned}LTA_a &= ECA_a \times \exp(0.5\sigma^2 - z\sigma) \\LTA_c &= ECA_c \times \exp(0.5\sigma_4^2 - z\sigma_4) \\LTA &= \min(LTA_c, LTA_a) \\AMEL &= LTA \times \exp(z\sigma_n - 0.5\sigma_n^2) \\MDEL &= LTA \times \exp(z\sigma - 0.5\sigma^2)\end{aligned}$$

where

ECA_a = acute effluent concentration allowance (equals acute criterion if no dilution)
 ECA_c = chronic effluent concentration allowance (equals chronic criterion if no dilution)
 LTA_a = acute long-term average
 LTA_c = chronic long-term average
 LTA = most stringent long-term average

AMEL = average monthly effluent limitation
MDEL = maximum daily effluent limitation

σ = standard deviation
CV = coefficient of variation (where $\sigma^2 = \ln(CV^2 + 1)$)
(CV = 0.6 where less than 10 data points are available)
z = z-statistic for 95th percentile probability (to calculate AMEL) or 99th percentile probability (to calculate LTAs and MDEL)
n = number of samples per month (n = 4 minimum)

Using the equations shown above, the water quality-based effluent limits developed for chlorine are summarized in following table:

Priority Pollutant	Aquatic Life Calculations											Selected Limits	
	Saltwater / Freshwater												
	ECA acute = C acute	ECA acute multiplier	LTA acute	ECA chronic = C chronic	ECA chronic multiplier	LTA chronic	Lowest LTA	AMEL multiplier 95	AMEL aquatic life	MDEL multiplier 99	MDEL aquatic life	AMEL	MDEL
	ug/L		ug/L	ug/L		ug/L	ug/L		ug/L		ug/L	mg/L	mg/L
Chlorine Residual	19	0.321 ¹	6.099	11	0.527 ¹	5.797	5.797	1.55 ¹	8.99	3.11 ¹	18.03	0.009	0.02

¹ Number of data points were less than 10, multipliers based on default CV = 0.6.

Conductivity, total dissolved solids, chloride, and sodium: The Basin Plan states, on Page III-3 Chemical Constituents, that “*Waters shall not contain constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.*” For conductivity (EC), *Ayers R.S. and D.W. Westcott, Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations – Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1, Rome (1985)*, reports levels above 700 μ mhos/cm will reduce crop yield for sensitive plants. The University of California, Davis Campus, Agricultural Extension Service, published a paper, dated 7 January 1974, stating that there will not be problems to crops associated with salt if the EC remains below 750 μ mhos/cm. Agricultural water quality limits for total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and sodium are 450 mg/L, 106 mg/L, and 69 mg/L respectively, based on Ayers and Westcott (1985).

The maximum EC measurement for the Discharger’s effluent, based on 10 recent samples, is 293 μ mhos/cm. The Discharger measured the concentration of total dissolved solids in its effluent at 210 mg/L on 3 April 2003 and at 200 mg/L on 24 April 2003. The Discharger measured the chloride concentration of its effluent at 7 mg/L and at 9 mg/L and the sodium concentration at 13 mg/L and 15 mg/L on 3 April 2003 and 24 April 2003 respectively. These effluent concentrations and the effluent conductivity do not exceed the agricultural water quality goals. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that effluent limitations for conductivity (EC at 25°C), total dissolved solids, chloride, or sodium are not required. This Order does, however, require monitoring for conductivity to confirm that the discharge will continue to meet these goals and will not adversely affect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

3. Basis for Receiving Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives from the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. They are included to protect beneficial uses of receiving waters. A receiving water condition not in conformance with a limitation is not necessarily a violation of the Order. The Regional Board may require an investigation to determine cause and culpability prior to asserting that a violation has occurred.

4. Basis for Groundwater Limitations

The Regional Board has determined that the discharge is not likely to impact the underlying groundwater. Therefore, this Order does not include specific groundwater limitations. This Order does include a requirement proscribing the discharge from causing underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents in concentrations greater than natural background quality.

5. Basis for Provisions

Provisions 1 through 7 and 9 through 12 are included in this Order to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Order pursuant to the CWA, CWC, implementing regulations, and the Basin Plan. Provision 8, allowing the permit to be re-opened, is based on 40 CFR 122.62.

6. Basis for Self-Monitoring Requirements

Pollutants to be monitored in the influent, effluent, and receiving water include parameters for which effluent limitations are specified, which may affect water quality, or with water quality objectives in the Basin Plan.

REOPENER

The conditions of discharge in this Order were developed based on currently available technical information, currently available discharge and surface water quality information, applicable water quality laws, regulations, policies, and plans, and are intended to assure conformance with them. As additional information is obtained, decisions will be made concerning the best means of assuring the highest water quality possible and that could involve substantial cost. It may be appropriate to reopen this Order if applicable laws and regulations change or if new information necessitates implementation of new or revised effluent limitations to adequately protect water quality.

CEQA

The action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) in accordance with CWC Section 13389.